

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, mailed July 20, 2005, has been received and reviewed. This response is substantially similar to the one filed on May 9, 2005 except in that the amendments contained herein have been altered so as to conform with the direction of 37 C.F.R. § 1.121. The present compliant amendment is filed within the one month provided by the above noted Notice of Non-Complaint Amendment.

Claims 1 through 20 are currently pending in the application. Applicants affirm the election to prosecute the invention of Group 1, claims 1 through 7, made during a telephone conversation between the Examiner and W. Bradley Haymond on January 26, 2005. Therefore, claims 8 through 20 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claims 1, 6, and 7 stand rejected. Claims 2 through 5 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claims is noted with appreciation. Applicants have amended claims 1-4, 6 and 7, have added new claims 21-33, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

Information Disclosure Statement(s)

Applicants note the filing of an Information Disclosure Statement herein on January 24, 2005 and note that a copy of the PTO-1449 was not returned with the outstanding Office Action.

Applicants respectfully request that all information cited on the PTO-1449 be made of record herein.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0020729A1 to Renz et al.

Claims 1, 6, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Renz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2005/0020729A1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v.*

Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitation of dependent claim 5, which claim the examiner has indicated to be allowable over Renz et al. Claims 2-4, 6, and 7 depend from and contain all of the limitations of amended claim 1. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 6, and 7 are allowable and request that the rejection based on Renz et al. be withdrawn.

New independent claim 21 includes all of the limitations of dependent claim 2, which claim the examiner has indicated to be allowable over Renz et al. Claims 21-26 depend from and contain all of the limitations of new claim 21. New independent claim 27 includes all of the limitations of dependent claim 4, which claim the examiner has indicated to be allowable over Renz et al. Claims 28-32 depend from and contain all of the limitations of new claim 27. New claim 33 includes all of the limitations of dependent claim 3, which claim the examiner has indicated to be allowable over Renz et al. In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that new claims 21-32 are likewise patentable and supported by the as-filed specification. Allowance of claims 21-32 is respectfully requested.

Objections to Claims 2 through 5/Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 through 5 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated to contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if placed in appropriate independent form. As previously described, claims 2 through 5 have been amended to place the same in independent form. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 2 through 5 is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to claim 1 and the new claims 21-33 should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application. The amendments made herein are believed to comply with the direction of 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 21-33 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned agent.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Morath, Ph.D.
Registration No. 55,896
Agent for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: August 22, 2005